
REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 have been canceled. New claims 8-23 have been added.

1. Response to rejections under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hendricks (US 6,675,386, hereinafter Hendricks). Under 35 USC 102, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (MPEP §2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). The MPEP further states that "A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 102(e) can be overcome by: (A) Persuasively arguing that the claims are patentably distinguishable from the prior art; (B) Amending the claims to patentably distinguish over the prior art . . . "(MPEP §706.02(a))

Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 are hereby canceled.

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to include additional details from the specifications for the communications system. In particular, the system is field-portable. The present invention can fit into two or three suitcase sized cases and be quickly and easily carried by people from place to place. Hendricks in contrast does not disclose the use of a field-portable computer within its system and does not allow rapid portability of the system by one or two people carrying the entire system.

Further distinguishing the present invention from Hendricks is the use of at least one satellite-telephone. While Hendricks refers to using a satellite to relay information as one of a long list of possible methods of relaying information over its very complex system, it does not refer specifically to the use of a satellite-telephone. The simple existence of satellite relays makes the use of satellites in general possible. The present invention uses at least one satellite-telephone as a particular method and embodiment that provides for a practical and field-portable system.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 5 as amended, do not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention as required under 35 USC 102(e) and the present invention is patentably

distinguishable from Hendricks, therefore the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusions

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Lisa M. Gehrke, Applicants' Attorney at (414) 774-0874 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.17(a)(2), Applicants request a three-month extension of time from July 3, 2007 to October 3, 2007 to respond to the April 3, 2007 Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants attach herewith a credit card authorization form authorizing payment of fees for the three-month extension of time.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 28, 2007

/lisa m gehrke/

Lisa M. Gehrke
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 38888

Gehrke & Associates, S.C.
123 North 86th Street
Wauwatosa, WI 53226
Tel. (414) 774-0874
lgehrke@gehrke-law.com